## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CRAIG ALFORD, No. 1:20-CV-01787

Plaintiff, (Chief Judge Brann)

v.

LEA BAYLOR, et al.,

Defendants.

## **ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 9<sup>th</sup> day of August 2022, in accordance with the accompanying Memorandum, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

- 1. Defendants' motion (Doc. 79) to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part, as follows:
  - a. Defendants' motion is **GRANTED** as to Alford's individual capacity Fourteenth Amendment due process claim against defendant Warden. Said claim is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.
  - b. Defendants' motion is **DENIED** in all other respects.
- 2. Alford's official capacity Fourteenth Amendment due process claims against defendants Baylor, Armond, and Warden are **DISMISSED** with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted.
- 3. No further leave to amend shall be granted as amendment would be futile and because Alford has failed to cure the deficiencies with previous amendments allowed. *See Grayson v. Mayview State Hosp.*, 293 F.3d 103, 114 (3d Cir. 2002).

4. This case shall proceed on the following claims: (1) Alford's official capacity Fourteenth Amendment due process claim against defendant Haidle, and (2) Alford's individual capacity Fourteenth Amendment due process claims against defendants Baylor, Armond, and Haidle.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Matthew W. BrannMatthew W. BrannChief United States District Judge